



NAA: M1767, 2/4

Series number: M1767

Control symbol: 2/4

Barcode: 30968196

Number of pages: 50

Title: The Governor-General's periodic confidential reports to The Queen [Sir Paul Hasluck – correspondence with The Queen – Palace letters] Part 4

Copies of this record are provided for research or study purposes. Before making use of the material for other purposes (for example publication) please refer to information on copyright obligations and citing archival records available on our website at www.naa.gov.au.

4th September, 1973.

We are looking forward keenly to the visit of Her Majesty in October and feel confident that she will be received with great loyalty and affection.

As the brief visit is centred on the opening of the Sydney Opera House, there will be the additional enthusiasm of a well-organised civic celebration in Sydney.

Nevertheless, I venture to draw attention to some changes in Australian outlook and attitudes which have been observed by me since Her Majesty's last previous visit.

Most of these changes seem to express a more assertive Australian nationalism, and some are much of a kind with the changes in modes and manners taking place throughout the Western World.

May I quote a few instances?

In a Gallup Poll taken in June the people interviewed were questioned on the proposed change in the Oath of Allegiance at naturalisation ceremonies. They were asked whether they favoured or opposed a proposal that new citizens should swear to uphold the Australian constitution and the law of Australia instead of swearing allegiance to The Queen. Sixty-eight percent said they favoured it, twenty-two percent opposed it, and ten percent were undecided. In the age group of 20 to 29 years, seventy-six percent favoured the change. The pollsters reported that those in favour often said: "Australia is Australia" or "Time we were independent".

The proposed change was rejected by the Senate and I understand the Government is now considering a suggestion that the oath of allegiance be taken to the "Queen of Australia".

In a Gallup Poll taken in July about a national anthem, twenty-eight percent wanted to retain "God Save The Queen" and sixty-four percent wanted "a truly Australian national anthem" and eight percent were undecided. In the age group from 16 to 29 years, seventy-five percent wanted "an Australian anthem". The highest support for "God Save The Queen" (fifty-nine percent) was in the age group over 70 years.

.../2

In a radio session recently I heard a "roving reporter" picking up opinions about the monarchy. I thought he put his various questions very unfairly but he managed to get most of those whom he interviewed to say in effect that they saw no reason why "The Queen of England" should "rule" Australia. He brushed aside the attempt by one of those questioned to establish that our Queen was "Queen of Australia".

On some public occasions recently, such as at public concerts, I have noticed an increase in numbers of those, mostly young, who ostentatiously remain seated when the National Anthem is played.

Another popular opinion poll showed strong support for the abolition of appeals to the Privy Council, accompanied by expressions of opinion that Australian Courts were "good enough for us".

Basically it seems to me that the shift of opinion illustrated by these reports comes from a stronger assertion of Australian nationalism rather than from any deliberate turning away from the Monarchy or from Britain.

This assertiveness seems to be in keeping with the current jargon of the young about "doing my own thing", or, at the undergraduate level: "We have to identify".

Some of the rise of nationalism may be the outcome of a feeling of uncertainty or disillusionment about the prospect of support from Britain or the United States of America in case of emergency, - a feeling that, in fact, we are on our own. There has been, of course, an enormous shift of economic activity towards Japan for exports, for imports and for development of mineral resources and perhaps more people are beginning to puzzle about the ways in which Australia can escape too much dependence on Japan. Some people may also be responding to the pushful speeches of the less reflective politicians about all the progress we are making and how big we now are.

I believe the Whitlam Government has caught the mood of the country in giving the appearance of being independent and "pro-Australian" and "standing up for Australia".

Unfortunately, however, the Government's attitude has also given encouragement to various minority groups of opinion, such as those who are anti-English, anti-American, anti-foreign, anti-establishment and anti-monarchy. I doubt very much whether any such group is anything other than a minority but each of them has taken the Australianism of the Whitlam Government as being an endorsement of its position.

In a curious way, too, the new approach to questions of loyalty and patriotism has become mixed up with the holding

of "advanced" views on social questions. It has become the vogue, especially among the younger generation, to hold "enlightened" views, and this often seems to mean only taking a different view from those whom they call "squares" on such questions as censorship, abortion, pornography, divorce, the national anthem, the flag, the observance of Anzac Day, the use of drugs, extra-marital relationships, the sort of clothes to wear, and the respect to be accorded to their elders. The influence of the media, especially some of the rather callow young television journalists, is often in the same direction. The young are flattered by the significance given to their views by reporters in search of a new angle.

The public discussion of these social questions has become highly confused and often illogical. The very young cannot be blamed for their immaturity but the encouragement given to them to air their views often makes a mess of any argument on a serious topic. I find myself puzzled almost every morning when I take up a newspaper and see firstly the publication of ill-founded and illogical pronouncements and secondly note the fact that they pass uncorrected. The attack on orthodoxy is news; the defence of it is not. The opinion of someone very young can be counted on to be more surprising than the opinion of someone old.

There is also a growing encouragement of the idea that it is smart to be casual and that, conversely, it is rather unpleasant to be correct. Any formality or correctness in conduct or in dress brands a person as someone who would probably be quite "unenlightened" on all social questions. This is a modern variant of the old Australian idea that any politician who dropped his aitches was more likely to be honest than one who spoke well.

Our new Government, in making a play for youth, seems to me to be neglecting its responsibility for leadership while eagerly trying to keep up with the trend. I doubt the outcome of winning the support of the ignorant by proving that one is just as ignorant as they are, but that is the current way of making the bid for popularity.

Mr Whitlam himself has taken to using the phrase "the middle ground" for describing the political area not occupied either by voters of the extreme right or the extreme left, and he often uses the phrase in a way that reveals that in his estimate the occupants of this "middle ground" are all people who want to discard the old ways. Some of his statements and actions would appear to express the idea that the way to give leadership to the young is to find out what they want to do and help them do it. More and more his government is playing to this gallery, but this remark should not be thought to lessen my recognition of the more substantial, bolder and more imaginative approach he has to the future of Australia than his opponents have.

.../4

One little oddity is the way in which Ministers are changing their Christian names. Incidentally Mr Whitlam always refers to them as "given names" because "Christian" is a word which to him is almost as suspect as "imperial". The man who used to be known as "William" Hayden and signed as "W.G. Hayden" now signs as "Bill" Hayden and insists that he so appears on documents. Mr J.F. Cairns becomes "Jim". And so on. Literally we have a Government of Tom, Dick and Harry, all getting on "given" name terms with the world.

Another development is the way in which public relations advisers and consultants are helping Ministers in the salesmanship of self. There are many more of these publicity staffs around both Government and Opposition than there used to be, and I have noticed not only the growth in numbers but a new slant in the selling. Apparently the calculation they have made is that the way to sell a man (unlike a soap powder) is not to show ways in which the product is better but to show ways in which it is just the same as others.

As well as changes in social modes and manners, other practices are changing. Recently Mr Whitlam went on to a television show with David Frost. It was highly entertaining and ran over an hour. The Prime Minister presented himself very well. Yet it was somewhat strange to find matters of high policy being discussed as part of a popular television show. Some old-fashioned folk wrote a few letters to the newspapers objecting to it and a few members of the Opposition suggested in Parliament that announcements on Government policy should have been given in the Australian Parliament and not on television in response to questions by a "foreign entertainer". Yet, in my observation, Mr Whitlam scored politically with a superb performance of television art; and in any case far more people became aware of the questions he and Frost discussed than would have noticed the topics if he had only answered questions by Snedden in the House.

Another phenomenon is the way in which the old principles of parliamentary government are sometimes being set aside by the claims of trade union leaders or other sections of the community to make decisions about questions of national policy and to enforce their decisions. In the course of any argument on a public question, some trade unions will decide what should be done and instruct their members to withhold services from some other section of the community to enforce their views. They take scant notice of any decision by government on the handling of a public question and the government can only handle such situations by looking in another direction.

It is evident, too, that the old rivalry between the Federal Government and State Governments is moving towards a crisis. Her Majesty will be familiar with the

assertion by the States of their "sovereign rights", with the arguments about the distribution of powers between the Commonwealth and States, and with the tendency for central power to grow. At the governmental level the contention has been given a sharper edge by the clearly centralist policy of the Whitlam Government and by the way in which the Prime Minister is disregarding some of the old usages. He calls the Commonwealth Parliament the Australian Parliament and the Commonwealth Government the Australian Government. In documents he now adopts this style. Many Federal publications now simply carry the word "Australia" in a manner that declares the unity of the nation and disregards the fact of Federation. The subordinate position of the States has been made more marked in several ways and consequently the States make stronger claims than ever to their "rights" and are more jealous than ever of the superior position of the Commonwealth.

One trivial example appeared this week at the opening of a Constitutional Convention in Sydney to review the Commonwealth Constitution. The Steering Committee invited the Governor-General to open the convention and did so quite properly, for Her Majesty is part of that Constitution and the position of Governor-General was created by it. In planning the opening ceremony, however, it was proposed that I should be received by the Premier of New South Wales and walk paired with him in the procession to the stage, while the Prime Minister was paired with one of the other Premiers in a less senior part of the procession. After some tactful suggestions on my part, but not without much conferring, the compromise was reached of having both the Prime Minister and the Premier receive the Governor-General on arrival and both walk with him, one on each side, into the Town Hall. For the procession they were unwilling to adopt a single file entrance with Premier, Prime Minister and Governor-General in tandem in that order, and we progressed down the aisle with the Premier and Prime Minister yoked together and Governor-General on his own behind them. The Premier introduced me and the Prime Minister thanked me.

Although the rivalry between Federal and State politicians is bound to continue, my own guess is that, among the populace, the new Australian nationalism would give a majority to Mr Whitlam on this issue unless centralism expressed itself in high-handed action on particular questions that awaken local rather than national loyalties.

This is perhaps a roundabout way of saying that Mr Whitlam may have an opportunity in front of him to be a significant figure in Australian history in building the new Australian nation. Up to the present, however, I have not been reassured that, in this field, he will be able to rise above his own gimmicks and seize the major issues. It is still an open question whether he has grasp as well as liveliness.

We in Australia are also experiencing some of the social problems that are seen in other parts of the world - drug taking and drug traffic, acts of purposeless violence, commercial promotion of pornography on stage, screen and magazine publishing and so on - but I doubt whether our experience in this regard is much different from what appears to be happening in Britain. We suffer the same decline in personal modesty. In these respects we are probably no better and no worse than comparable countries and, as in Britain, there is still a quiet majority who believe in old-fashioned decency, consideration for others and respect for the law. There is also a growing concern on all sides about what is happening to our moral standards.

In describing the changes I can offer no view on the extent or depth of the new outlook. I have mentioned what is noticeable and have not assessed its significance.

The main impression I wish to leave with Her Majesty is that Australian modes and manners are undergoing change. It cannot be accepted with certainty that the Australia of today is much the same as the Australia of yesterday. Nor do I think that the trend of change can be traced clearly and exactly enough to predict the shape of the Australia of tomorrow. The changes are not complete.

Behind it all, however, I feel sure that the great majority of the Australian people are still kind, friendly and responsive to friendship, quick to acknowledge common sense and to admire courage and straightforward talking, and intolerant of what, in their own slang, they regard as "crawling" (or insincere attempts at ingratiation) or pretentiousness. I believe it is still a land where most people believe in giving a man a "fair go" and in judging persons on their own worth.

I also feel sure that Her Majesty, as Queen of Australia, can meet Her people with full confidence in both the deep respect they have for the way She is doing Her duty as their Queen and the affection they feel towards Her.

I trust that these few observations, imperfect though they may be, may be of interest to Her Majesty in preparing for Her forthcoming tour and I would like to take this opportunity of offering respectfully and with humble duty my own good wishes for a pleasant journey, a happy arrival and a safe return.

Lieutenant-Colonel the Right Honourable
 Sir Martin Charteris, K.C.B., K.C.V.O., O.B.E.,
 Private Secretary to The Queen,
 Buckingham Palace,
LONDON. SW1 ENGLAND.



BALMORAL CASTLE

PERSONAL AND
CONFIDENTIAL

14th September, 1973.

Dear Gorman Gorman

Thank you very much for your letter of 4th September.

The Queen has read this with close interest and commands me to thank you for sending these valuable comments on some of the changes in Australian outlook. All these were of interest to Her Majesty and particularly those which affect, or may affect, the position of the Monarchy in Australia. Your comments are timely and, if I may say so with great respect, wise and perspicacious.

I think it is quite clear that if the Monarchy in Australia is to flourish and be of real service to Australia, every opportunity ought to be taken to emphasize that The Queen is genuinely "Queen of Australia" and not "The Queen of England ruling in Australia" as suggested by your roving reporter.

I hope the agreement reached between The Queen and Mr. Whitlam at Windsor last April about the change in Her Majesty's Style and Title in Australia will be translated into action and will be a help in getting the constitutional reality of The Queen's position understood.

If you can suggest any other way by which understanding can be improved, perhaps in Her Majesty's speeches when she is in Australia in October, and later next year, I hope you will let me know. I am sure that The Queen's visits will provide opportunities which ought not to be missed.

- 2 -

Much of what you describe of public attitudes in Australia is, as you say, familiar to those who live in Britain. This is certainly the age of disrespect for established institutions and customs, and I believe it is a great tribute to The Queen that in spite of this, the deep respect in which she is held by the great majority in this country, and, indeed, wherever she goes, has not been diminished.

The Queen is much looking forward to her visit in October and sends her best wishes to you and to Lady Hasluck.

Yours sincerely
Marian Thorne

His Excellency the Right Honourable
Sir Paul Hasluck, G.C.M.G., G.C.V.O.

Government House,
Canberra. 2600.

17th September, 1973.

My dear Private Secretary,

This afternoon I gave my assent to the Australian Citizenship Act 1973 (No 99 of 1973).

This Act substitutes a new Oath of Allegiance and a new Affirmation of Allegiance for those contained in the Second and Third Schedules of the Citizenship Act 1948-1969. The new forms of oath and affirmation read as follows:-

Schedule 2

Oath of Allegiance

I, A.B., renouncing all other allegiance, swear by Almighty God that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Australia, Her heirs and successors according to law, and that I will faithfully observe the laws of Australia and fulfil my duties as an Australian citizen.

Affirmation of Allegiance

I, A.B., renouncing all other allegiance, solemnly and sincerely promise and declare that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Australia, Her heirs and successors according to law, and that I will faithfully observe the laws of Australia and fulfil my duties as an Australian citizen.

Schedule 3

Oath of Allegiance

I, A.B., renouncing all other allegiance, swear by Almighty God that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Australia, Her heirs and successors according to law.

Affirmation of Allegiance

I, A.B., renouncing all other allegiance, solemnly and sincerely promise and declare that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Australia, Her heirs and successors according to law.

.../2

The other provisions of the amending Act do not appear to me to affect the constitutional position of the Crown.

Yours sincerely,

Lieutenant-Colonel the Right Honourable
Sir Martin Charteris, K.C.B., K.C.V.O., O.B.E.,
Private Secretary to The Queen,
Buckingham Palace,
LONDON. SWI. ENGLAND.

CONFIDENTIAL

Government House,
Canberra. 2600.

9th October, 1973.

As reported by cablegram, I administered oaths of office this morning to four Ministers to give effect to a Cabinet re-shuffle recommended by the Prime Minister.

As Mr Whitlam explained to me in a private conversation before recommending these immediate changes, he had it in mind to make a wider re-adjustment of his Ministry later in the year. The probable date of these changes was to be December when, with the granting of self-government to Papua New Guinea, the need for a Minister for External Territories would virtually disappear. He found, however, that he could not defer all the changes for that long and so he is tackling the reconstruction of his Ministry in two (or even possibly three stages).

The over-all reconstruction, as he explained it to me in confidence, is required for three reasons. First of all, some Ministers are "in trouble" and "not doing well" and he wants to shift them out of harm's way. Secondly, he wants to relieve some Ministers, who are carrying more than one portfolio, of some of the burden of office. Thirdly, some changes are to be made in the administrative structure which will lead to the disappearance or amalgamation of some departments.

His complete plan is something like this -

- (a) The Prime Minister will cease to be Foreign Minister and give that portfolio to Senator Willesee, now Special Minister for State.
- (b) The Defence Minister, Mr Barnard, gives up the Department of Supply. The Service Departments (Navy, Army and Air) will be brought under a single Ministry of Defence.
- (c) The Minister for Trade and Industry, Dr J.F. Cairns, gives up Secondary Industry, which is being linked with the Department of Supply under one Minister.
- (d) The Customs Department will be abolished. Its law enforcement functions will stay with the Attorney-General, Senator Murphy, who is Minister for Customs at present, and its revenue-collecting functions will go to the Taxation Commission. Senator Murphy's work load will be lightened by the appointment of another Minister as Leader of the Government in the Senate.

- (e) Transport and Civil Aviation will be joined under a single Minister, Mr Jones.
- (f) The Department of Works will be placed in the same Department as Housing, under Mr L.C. Johnson.
- (g) The Minister for Northern Development, Mr Patterson, will also be given the functions now carried out by the Minister for the Northern Territory.

One of the reasons why all these changes could not be carried out in one stage is that two of the Ministers who are key figures in the changes - Senator Willesee and Mr Patterson - are overseas on Ministerial duty; another one, Senator Bishop, is ill in hospital; and a fourth, Mr Morrison, will not be free of his duties as Minister for External Territories until December.

I gather that the reason why Mr Whitlam thought that he could not wait to put the grand plan into effect but had to move now was the troubles being caused for the Government by Mr Bryant as Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and by Mr Enderby as Minister for the Capital Territory and Minister for the Northern Territory.

Mr Enderby is not without ability and a sense of responsibility and may yet make a good Minister but he has been rather precipitate and high-handed and undoubtedly has caused electoral disadvantage to the Government in the Northern Territory (now held by the Country Party but a possible Labour seat) and in the Australian Capital Territory (now held by Mr Enderby himself). It was probably an initial mistake to give him Ministerial authority in matters with which he was already directly concerned with his own constituents.

Mr Bryant, a loud-mouthed, cheerful, chaser of the band waggon, has been almost calamitously bad as Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. In my opinion he has done grievous harm to the aboriginal people themselves by unwise and over-generous policies and has greatly added to the problems of Australia by what I can only describe as racial segregation, even although it may be intended as discrimination in favour of the coloured person. He has embarrassed the Prime Minister by his wholly personal approach to the distribution of benefits and by the employment of his family and friends in the activities of his office.

While Enderby was willing to accept the change, Bryant resisted it. The Prime Minister told me that if Bryant did not resign his portfolio he would recommend the termination of his appointment. I assume he got Bryant's resignation by telling him this. The intention is that ultimately Bryant will go into the discard as Minister for Repatriation and that Senator Bishop, when he recovers from his illness, will succeed Bryant in his new portfolio of the Capital Territory. There is a risk that Bryant may promote some sort of public agitation against his removal from Aboriginal Affairs.

The other Ministers affected by the changes made today are said to be quite happy with the proposals. I understand, however, that Mr Whitlam has not disclosed all aspects of his grand plan to all his Ministers so what I have written above should be kept in the closest confidence. If the grand plan can be carried through to completion I think it will lead to better government.

The political situation generally has fallen into some disarray. Inflationary pressure continues. There have also been more industrial troubles, especially of a kind (such as in electrical power stations and in civil aviation) that causes great personal inconvenience to members of the community. This has led to political sparring between Government and Opposition and between Commonwealth and State Governments rather than to any move towards improvement. The question of what should be done has been subordinated to the question of who is to blame and no one is coming out of it very well.

As part of this disarray, at the recent Constitutional Convention in Sydney, much of the time was spent in argument about whether the Commonwealth should have power to control prices. In the following weeks the argument spread into assertions that wages as well as prices ought to be controlled. It seems to me that the Prime Minister got mixed up in too many manoeuvres and now finds himself preparing for a battle that he is bound to lose. A Bill is going through the Australian Parliament for the holding of a referendum of the people of Australia, probably in December, to give the Commonwealth power to control both prices and "incomes". With division in the Australian Labour Party as well as between the major political parties on the subject I cannot see any chance that the question will be carried.

In the meantime the contest in the parliamentary session is sharpening. I have heard rumours that the Senate may refuse to grant Supply at the end of the period of sitting and that this may bring a double dissolution. While not discounting the possibility of such a challenge to the Government, or the possibility that the Prime Minister may accept the challenge, I would prefer not to discuss the rumour but wait for the parliamentary situation to become clearer.

As well as suffering somewhat in the tangled manoeuvres over inflation, industrial trouble and prices, I think the Whitlam Government may have also lost some public favour through its attitudes to oil exploration, mining development and foreign investment. While most people like them to be watchful of Australian interests and careful on the exploitation of Australian resources, the Government have also given an unfortunate impression of trying to tell everyone what they cannot do, while being quite unclear about what they can do.

As this will be the last despatch I have a chance to write before Her Majesty leaves for Her Australian visit, may I mention in closing that there will be an opportunity for Her Majesty to act visibly as Queen of Australia, while She is in Australia, by giving Her assent to the Royal Style and Titles Bill (which I have reserved for Her pleasure), by making the Royal Warrant for the Great Seal and possibly by issuing some Commissions. I trust these can be handled as distinctive Royal acts, demonstrating to the people that The Queen is in fact and in name Queen of Australia.

Lieutenant-Colonel the Right Honourable Sir Martin Charteris,
 K.C.B., K.C.V.O., O.B.E.,
 Private Secretary to The Queen,
 Buckingham Palace,
LONDON. SW1. ENGLAND.

PERSONAL



Government House,
Sydney,

21st October, 1973.

Dear Governor General

On her departure from Canberra The Queen commanded me to write to you to send you and Lady Hasluck her warm thanks for having made her and The Duke of Edinburgh so comfortable at Government House during their brief but enjoyable stay.

The delightful surroundings and relaxed atmosphere of Yarralumla were exactly what Her Majesty needed to recover from the long journey from London and the jet lag that always goes with it. She is most grateful to you both and to your courteous and efficient staff.

All members of the Household in attendance are also in your debt and they have asked me to send you their sincere thanks.

May I also say how much I personally valued the opportunity of meeting you and having some discussion with you whilst I was in Canberra. Letters are all right but they cannot take the place of conversation! It has been a real pleasure for me to return to Australia after nearly twenty years, and to see the remarkable changes that have taken place. I look forward very much to another visit next year.

Yours sincerely
Martin Charteris

His Excellency the Governor-General
of Australia.



BUCKINGHAM PALACE

PERSONAL AND
CONFIDENTIAL

11th March, 1974.

Dear Governor General

Who would have thought it! As a student of politics you must be fascinated by what is going on in this country and I should greatly value your prognosis as to what is going to happen next!

On The Queen's instructions I have written to the Prime Minister to express Her Majesty's sincere regret to him that events in this country have upset her plans for her visit to Western Australia, South Australia and the Northern Territory. Her Majesty wishes me also to express these regrets to you, and to say how sorry she is that she has been denied the pleasure of entertaining you and Lady Hasluck personally in H.M.Y. BRITANNIA at Darwin.

The Queen has also told me to send her warm thanks to you both for having entertained her at Government House during that all too brief period which, although it seems years ago, was I am assured by my diary, only ten days past. As always she was happy at Yarralumla, and was made extremely comfortable by you and your admirable staff.

May I also take the opportunity of this letter to send you and Lady Hasluck my personal thanks for the kindness and hospitality you have always extended to me, not least on 27th February.

I hope we shall see you in London some time soon after you have given up your office as Governor-General. I know you will let me know what your plans are.

Yours sincerely

Martin Charteris

His Excellency the Governor-General
of Australia.

Government House,
Canberra. 2600.

11 April, 1974.

My dear Private Secretary,

I have the honour to inform Her Majesty The Queen that, with Her permission and on the advice of my Prime Minister, I represented Australia at the memorial service for the late President of the French Republic, Monsieur Georges Pompidou, in the Cathedral of Notre Dame, Paris, on April 6, 1974.

Mr Whitlam first asked me to attend the service soon after news of Monsieur Pompidou's death was received on Tuesday, April 2. He said that attendance by the Governor-General on such occasions was the most fitting form of representation of Australia and, in this particular instance, having regard to recent strain between France and Australia as a result of Australian opposition to nuclear tests in the Pacific, the Government wished to do nothing less than the best that might be expected by France.

I delayed my reply partly because of programme difficulties but largely because there were signs that a political crisis was looming in Australia. I put plainly to Mr Whitlam my view that the Governor-General should not be out of Australia if there was a prospect of major constitutional issues arising. Furthermore he would expose himself to criticism if it could be represented by his opponents that he had got the Governor-General out of the country to ask for a dissolution of Parliament in his absence, Mr Whitlam accepted both points.

Consequently the decision to go was not made until the morning of Thursday, April 4, and it was only made after I had received an assurance from Mr Whitlam that, in a charged parliamentary situation, the political crisis was not likely to occur until the following week. This accounts for the lateness of my message seeking the permission of Her Majesty to leave my post.

.../2

-2-

The decision having been made at 10 a.m. on Thursday, I left for Paris at 4 p.m. I returned to Australia on the morning of Tuesday, April 9, after spending three nights out of five sitting up in an aeroplane.

The visit proved worth while. Representation of Australia at this level was appreciated by the French Government.

As in the case of the celebrations at Persepolis, the question arose of the precedence to be accorded to a Governor-General in the absence of Her Majesty The Queen. The Quai d'Orsay readily accepted the order established in Iran and placed the Governor-General in a special class after the Presidential heads of state and before the "representatives of heads of state" and Prime Ministers.

The political crisis did not come to a head until after my return. On that I shall be writing in another despatch after the series of actions arising from it have been completed.

During my absence from Australia His Excellency the Governor of Victoria, Sir Rohan Delacombe was Administrator of the Commonwealth of Australia.

Yours sincerely,

PAUL HASLUCK

Lieutenant-Colonel
the Honourable Sir Martin Charteris,
K.C.B., K.C.V.O., O.B.E.,
Private Secretary to The Queen,
Buckingham Palace,
LONDON. ENGLAND.

CONFIDENTIAL

Government House,
Canberra. 2600.

22 April 1974.

As reported by telegram, I dissolved the Australian Parliament on Friday, 12 April, and in Executive Council, fixed 18 May as polling day.

The letter addressed to me by the Prime Minister seeking a double dissolution listed six Bills which had twice failed to pass the Senate after having been passed by the House of Representatives on two occasions at an interval of three months. I accepted this situation as meeting the requirements of Section 57 of the Australian Constitution. The submission was supported, at my request, by an opinion by the Attorney-General and a joint opinion by the Attorney-General and Solicitor-General on constitutional points at issue. I also received an assurance from the Prime Minister that Supply had been granted and that the electoral machinery was in such a condition as to permit elections to be held after the dissolution on the proposed date for polling.

Although there had been much talk for some months past about the possibility of a double dissolution the political crisis developed quickly and unexpectedly.

Ever since he came to office and faced a non-Labour majority in the Senate the Prime Minister had taken some care to build up evidence to support a case for a double dissolution in case he ever found it advantageous to seek one. I doubt, however, whether he planned to make a submission at this time. The advice he gave to me in March to submit to the electors by referendum four Bills which the Senate had failed to pass, including one to synchronise elections for the two Chambers, was given in a way that indicated that, while he was keen on having a referendum, he was not thinking of a general election at the same time. The planning he made for the periodical election for half of the Senate on 18 May pointed the same way. Finally, his attempt in mid-March to play a smart trick by the appointment of a Queensland Senator as Ambassador to Ireland is proof that he had in mind only an election for half the Senate and not a double dissolution as the trick would be purposeless if a double dissolution were in prospect.

This trick started the chain of events which led to the request to dissolve Parliament. Her Majesty may be interested to hear the story more fully.

.../2

- 2 -

The central figure is Senator Gair, who was at one time Premier and parliamentary leader of the Australian Labour Party in Queensland. He left the Labour Party in 1956 when the Democratic Labour Party was formed. Subsequently he lost the Premiership in 1957 and his seat in the Queensland Parliament in 1960. He was elected to the Senate for Queensland in 1964, taking his seat at Canberra on 1 July, 1965, and he then became Parliamentary Leader of the D.L.P. He remained in this position until a few months ago, when he retired to make way for Senator McManus. Now 73 years of age, he has visibly deteriorated in personal habit over recent years and both he and his party have declining prospects for the future. As a party leader he was often invited to Government House for State dinners and Her Majesty may possibly remember a sight of him as a short, fat, red-faced, garrulous, coarse and half-drunk guest last October. Once respected as a tough and shrewd politician who could see the way a cat would jump even while it was still sleeping, he was correctly evaluated by Mr Whitlam as a man who had now become venal through self-indulgence. The Prime Minister, through an intermediary, enticed him with the offer of being Australian Ambassador to Dublin.

To explain the reason for the Prime Minister's move, may I remind Her Majesty that, under the system of counting votes in the Senate, when five Senators retire for a periodical election the outcome is bound to be that one side of politics will win three places and the other side two places. In Queensland the prospect was that non-Labour parties would gain three and Labour two. By making an additional vacancy by Gair's retirement, six places would be contested and non-Labour would still only be able to win three - (the counting makes a result of four seats to two virtually impossible) - and Labour would also win three, thus gaining a seat.

The Prime Minister himself handled the matter when his Foreign Minister, Senator Willesee, was out of the country on an official mission and Mr Whitlam had become Acting Foreign Minister. I learnt later that Senator Willesee was not only unaware of the move at the time - although a contrary impression was given to me by the Prime Minister - but, as Senator Willesee himself told me later, he disapproved of the move both as a bad appointment and as a political blunder. The Prime Minister himself brought the proposal to me with a recommendation for approval and, saying that Senator Gair had not yet told his own party about it, asked that the matter be kept in close confidence for the time being. In the necessary Executive Council actions he was joined only by the Attorney-General, Senator Murphy, who is Leader of the Government in the Senate. In answer to questions by me I received what I can only regard now as equivocal advice from the Attorney-General regarding the freedom of Senator Gair to accept an appointment while still serving as a Senator. The Attorney-General also said explicitly that my approval was an approval of an intention to appoint and that appointment in a formal sense would come after agreement had been received from the Government of Ireland and when Letters of Credence were issued. I was assured of Senator Gair's willingness to accept nomination and of his intention to inform his party and to resign

from the Senate forthwith. The nomination therefore seemed in order for approval.

The plans became unstuck when Senator Gair did not take either step promptly but continued to take part in the proceedings and votes of the Senate, and when the story of the appointment "leaked" out from somewhere close to the Prime Minister. Then the Premier of Queensland, Mr Bjelke-Petersen, countered the trick by issuing writs for a Senate election for Queensland on 18 May for five Senators only and he and his supporters argued that Senator Gair was still a member of the Senate and there was no exceptional sixth vacancy. At this stage, Senator Murphy, in the Senate, made statements in the Senate (directly contrary to what he had advised me) to the effect that the appointment had been made at the time the nomination had been first made to the Governor-General and that six vacancies already existed. This got him into an awful jam, and, in the Senate debate, the non-Labour Opposition clearly won the honours.

The discomfort of the Government, the debating victory of the Opposition and the loss of reputation of the Government by the exposure of their trick led the way to intensive days of parliamentary bluff. The Opposition professed to be forcing the Government to go to the country. "Jump or be pushed", said the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate. The Government was threatening the Opposition with a double dissolution. In the end they outbluffed each other. The Opposition in the Senate, in challenging the Government, provided it with all the remaining evidence needed to build up Mr Whitlam's case that a situation described in Section 57 of the Constitution existed.

Probably the Opposition would have preferred to have had a dissolution of the House of Representatives only, leaving half of the Senate intact and its continuing majority in the Senate safe for the future; but the Government, which might have preferred to go its full term, got a double dissolution, which presents it with the risk of losing office but, if it can hold office, a better chance of coming back with even numbers in the Senate.

Her Majesty would not wish to be wearied with the details of the final hectic hours during which various steps had to be taken in strict legal sequence to close down Parliament and start an election. These kept me busy until the eve of Good Friday, when I went to Perth and had a few restful days in the bush in the hills, watching birds and kangaroos and breathing clean air.

I was somewhat disappointed in Mr Whitlam's behaviour over the Gair episode, for I have gained an increasing regard for him and believe him to be far and away the best Prime Minister available to Australia at present.

.../4

Mr Whitlam has also disappointed me by making a rather precipitate press announcement this week, without any warning to me or anyone else, about the national anthem. He said that he had asked the Defence Minister to instruct all defence service bands to play "Advance Australia Fair" and not "God Save The Queen" at the annual Anzac Day services. In doing this he showed lack of consideration to those who organise these ceremonies, for the services of commemoration are not arranged by the Government but by trustees of war memorials and organisations of ex-service men. He also showed lack of courtesy both to Her Majesty and to Her Majesty's representatives throughout Australia in not informing them of his intention. Furthermore, I think that, as a matter of form, national anthems should be established in a more solemn way than making a press statement. I intend to say all this to him.

I suspect that in taking this precipitate action Mr Whitlam has been misled by some of his personal back-room team of urgers. He may please a few people who already support him but has displeased many more who were persuadable.

In the meantime, there is a good deal of discussion in all capitals about what will happen at Anzac Day services and the Premier of one State has publicly said that in his State the national anthem is still "God Save The Queen" and nothing else is to be played in its place. I have privately indicated that, at the Anzac Day service in Canberra, I will expect to be received on arrival by the customary six bars of "God Save The Queen".

Incidentally, in past years, the opening bars of "Advance Australia Fair" used to precede the A.B.C. news sessions. If they are substituted for the Royal Salute to a Governor-General or a State Governor on arrival at a ceremony I feel sure that many of the audience would be unconsciously pausing to hear the music followed by a rather plummy voice saying: "This is the national news read by James Dibble."

In this despatch I will not attempt to rehearse for Her Majesty the issues at the forthcoming elections, for the policy speeches have not yet been delivered. Nor will I attempt to make any prediction of the likely outcome. At present the prospects seem fairly even. Within a week or two, I will do myself the honour of presenting to Her Majesty a more thoughtful assessment of the chances.

Yours sincerely,

PAUL HASLICK

Lieutenant-Colonel the Right Honourable
Sir Martin Charteris, K.C.B., K.C.V.O., O.B.E.,
Private Secretary to The Queen,
Buckingham Palace,
LONDON. ENGLAND.



WINDSOR CASTLE

Personal and Confidential

25th April, 1974.

Dear Governor General

Thank you very much for your letter of 11th April which I have laid before The Queen.

Her Majesty is grateful to you for writing, and hopes you were not too exhausted by spending three nights out of five sitting up in an aeroplane. The Queen commented that your experience in this regard was worse than hers had been !

Her Majesty looks forward to receiving your account of the political crisis.

So, I need hardly say, does Her Majesty's Private Secretary who is not uninterested at the moment in anything to do with the prerogative of Dissolution!

Yours sincerely
Martin Zentgraf

His Excellency the Governor-General
of Australia.



WINDSOR CASTLE

PERSONAL AND
CONFIDENTIAL

3rd May, 1974.

Dear Governor General

Thank you very much indeed for your letter of 22nd April which I have shown to The Queen and which Her Majesty has read with the greatest interest.

Her Majesty will be following the progress of the election campaign with close attention and it is very useful for her to have your account of the circumstances which led to the double Dissolution.

I have no doubt that you are awaiting the results with interest. I should imagine that the Prime Minister is a formidable campaigner and will do better than the pollsters predict.

The Queen does, indeed, remember Mr. Gair from October, but fortunately has happier memories of him when he travelled in GOTHIC with her off the Barrier Reef in 1954.

*Yours sincerely
Maurice Chantre*

His Excellency the Governor-General
of Australia.

CONFIDENTIAL

Government House,
Canberra. 2600.

6 May 1974.

In my despatch of 22 April, in which I did myself the honour of informing Her Majesty of the dissolution of the Australian Parliament, I wrote that in a week or two I would attempt an assessment of the political prospects. Today I am far from clear about what will happen at the poll on 18 May, but venture to set down some impressions of the campaign in the hope that they will be of some interest and value to Her Majesty.

While keeping a proper sense of the fact that The Queen's representative has no political partisanship, may I express the view that the best prospect of stable government and capable administration is in the return of the Whitlam Government. With all his faults, Mr Whitlam seems to me to be the best Prime Minister in sight at the moment and, although the Labour Party has made some controversial moves, it seems to me to be likely to furnish a Ministry of higher capacity, clearer purpose and greater cohesion than the Opposition parties.

About six weeks ago I would have said that the obvious superiority of the Government over the Opposition in talent, unity and clearness of policy would be likely to ensure its return. Perhaps my own view that the alternative government would be a worse one may contribute to my present anxiety lest the Government lose office.

Certainly, all the indications now are that the result will be very close. Newspaper correspondents predict a "cliff-hanger".

One reason for uncertainty about the outcome is that voting patterns will be complicated by the fact that three polls are being taken on the same day. On going to the polling booth, the elector will be presented with three ballot papers - one for the Senate, one for the House of Representatives and one for the Constitutional Referendum. In the two elections for Parliament he has to put a number in the square opposite each name in the order of his preference and if he leaves a square blank or becomes confused and uses the same number twice his vote will be informal. In the referendum the ballot paper will carry in sequence the titles of four Bills and he will have to write "Yes" or "No" in a square opposite each of the four Bills.

.../2

On the Senate paper, the names of candidates are listed vertically in columns according to party or political group but nothing appears on the paper to identify one party or group from another. The order in which the parties or groups appear on the paper is pre-determined by drawing lots.

In New South Wales this year there will be 73 names of candidates for the Senate set out in nineteen separate columns on a ballot paper measuring 27 inches by 8 inches.

Some of the political groupings were formed for the occasion of the election. According to one newspaper story, this proliferation of candidates was deliberately promoted in order to increase the number of informal votes and thus lessen the chances of the Labour Party in the Senate, it being argued from the statistics of previous elections that, because of lower standards of education among unskilled workers, more informal votes are cast by Labour voters than by non-Labour voters. I do not know the truth of this story, but the newspaper writer claimed to have evidence that several of the deposits of one hundred dollars required of a candidate had come from one source and that various persons had been approached to become candidates for the purpose of forming new groups.

Even in one of the States of smaller population, Western Australia, the Senate ballot paper will carry 29 names.

The task of the New South Wales voter will be to number his Senate paper correctly from 1 to 73, after identifying the candidates; then vote by placing a number in each square for six or seven candidates for his lower House electorate; and then examine his Referendum paper and, having identified the subject matter of the Bills, write "Yes" or "No" four times. Some analysts have said that a knowledgeable person accustomed to form-filling might spend five minutes in the polling booth and that most voters will take eleven minutes or much more. They predict confusion but the electoral effect of confusion is unpredictable. I fear that many voters will be flustered or impatient when they vote.

A second development is the apparent fact that the Liberal Party is spending far more than usual. Their full-page newspaper advertisements and television features would seem to be costing very big sums and much more than anything done in previous campaigns. They obviously exceed what the Labour Party is able to afford. Some of the publicity is cleverly done. Some is not very scrupulous. I cannot even guess what the effect will be of this advertising but it may be balanced by a suspicion in the mind of the average householder that the rich people are backing the Liberals and that there must be something doubtful about any product in need of so much costly salesmanship.

The election campaign is being conducted on both sides with a good deal of American-style bally-hoo. When I raised the question recently with one observer whether this sort of noisiness and contrived enthusiasm would win many votes in Australia, he said that

.../3

it had a great appeal to the young and was designed to "fetch them". In this election the age group between 18 to 24 will be significant and public opinion polls on almost any question suggest that their views are different from those of other groups. The party which wins them may win the election.

In any case, this campaign is becoming a merry romp for smart public relations officers and hired journalists. Daily we read of this and that new-found little genius "master-minding" this or that campaign. One suspects that in the backrooms of parties there are persons who think a gimmick wins more votes than a policy.

I have some doubt myself whether their romping helps those who pay them. They seldom know much about politics and do not appreciate the simple fact that a party or a candidate has to be concerned about not losing votes as well as about winning votes. Mr Whitlam is often being sold a bright idea that makes his backroom boys nappy but may lose him the favour of some uncommitted voter in the outer suburbs. His folly over "God Save The Queen" on Anzac Day is a case in point.

I think that two of the risks to Mr Whitlam's return are a succession of these minor errors in accepting bright ideas which offend a succession of minority groups needlessly. The other is some improvement in the presentation to the people of the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Snedden.

One of the major reasons why I would have felt confident of the return of Mr Whitlam earlier in the year was that he looked so much more like a Prime Minister than Mr Snedden did. In my view that was the truth of the matter. Now the Opposition is spending a lot of effort and money on Mr Snedden's "image" and are creating a figure, which although not true to life, may have a wider appeal than the truth. It is a cosmetic campaign by cosmetic salesmen. I have the disadvantage of having known Mr Snedden in various capacities since he was a student and regard him as a person of very poor calibre and perhaps I see too clearly the falsity of what he is now represented to be. Others may be persuaded to see him differently. One can never be sure how successful the building up of a political figure is in the short run.

One of the more substantial issues which has emerged in the campaign is inflation. In effect, each party is saying that its opponent was, is, or would be incapable of mastering inflation, but none of them is very precise or practical about what it will do itself. I believe that many persons are concerned about inflation in general terms and some are concerned in the loss of the value of savings or decline in purchasing power of fixed incomes but, on the other hand, up to the present the majority have not felt immediately, directly and personally some injury which they identify as the result of inflation. There is grumbling about the way prices are going up but I think we are still at a stage when the customer blames the manufacturer, or the retailer, or the workman on strike, or someone who is making too much profit or getting another rise in wages, or some other visible object of dislike, rather than relating

.../4

the circumstance to the management of the economy. Many of the grumblers find compensation in higher incomes for the higher prices. I doubt whether, in spite of newspaper editorials, the mass of elector will vote for or against the Labour Party on the subject of inflation or that they will vote Liberal in the belief that they will handle inflation more wisely. The employment level keeps high and in my experience employment or unemployment has more influence on the average voter than a discussion of the nation's economy.

Another issue that is emerging might be described as "a fair go for Labour". On the one hand the Government says that it was elected at the end of 1972 to do a job for the country and now, after only 17 months, it has been interrupted in doing this job by the obstruction of a Senate, half of which was elected four and a half years ago. Labour asks the electors to return them so that they can get on with the job. On the other hand the Opposition says in effect that it only needed a little over a year to show how dangerous Labour can be when it gets power. Now there is a chance, they say, to remove that danger for ever.

I have a feeling that the "fair go" argument may be the strongest appeal that the Labour Party has and that it may bring about its return to office. Labour can add to that appeal some achievements and a record of promptness and purpose in government. On the other hand it carries the handicap of almost continuous industrial trouble of a kind causing inconvenience to the general public, shortages of supplies in articles of every-day use, and the laying-off of other factory workers because materials or parts are unobtainable.

When I try to put myself into the place of the uncommitted voter - the swinging voter who does not follow any firm party allegiance - I would be inclined to vote Labour again to give the Government a chance to complete its work and because I thought it was too early to condemn it. I would also come to the conclusion that Mr Whitlam would be a better Prime Minister than Mr Snedden and that the Labour Party would provide a more stable government and a greater degree of unity behind their leader than the Liberal and Country Parties would do. From a sort of basic faith that the swinging voter will go reasonably along some such line of thinking, my present assessment would still favour the return of the Whitlam Government. Yet at the same time there are so many incalculable elements in the campaign and I am so unfitted to assess the effects of all the ballyhoo and the building up of Mr Snedden that I cannot predict that outcome with confidence.

Polling is on 18 May. Unless there is a decided victory for the Government, I would expect a period of possibly a week or more before the results of the vote are clear enough for any measures to be taken about the formation of a new Ministry.

.../5

I hope to be able to write again, perhaps more briefly, shortly before polling day, in order to inform Her Majesty of the probable course of events following election day.

Lieutenant-General the Right Honourable
Sir Martin Charteris, K.C.B., K.C.V.O., O.B.E.,
Private Secretary to The Queen,
Buckingham Palace,
LONDON. SW1. ENGLAND.

CONFIDENTIAL

Government House,
Canberra. 2600.

6 May 1974.

Sir John Kerr has informed me that he will visit London in early June prior to taking up office as Governor-General, and I thought it might be helpful to you if I were to make a few general observations about the Governor-Generalship and Sir John's accession to it. It may be that some of my comments may assist you in any advice you may be called upon to give to Her Majesty.

It would be quite improper of me to discuss my successor personally and I need only say that the announcement of his name was well received and was acceptable to both sides of politics. If there were a change of government at the elections on 18 May it would make no difference to his acceptability here. This is part of the wisdom of the recommendation made to Her Majesty by Mr Whitlam.

Before any name was placed before Her Majesty I had several discussions with Mr Whitlam and was able to guide him on the procedure of consultation and the need for avoiding any prior canvassing of names with other persons. He confided to me his views both about the requirements of the office and some of the persons who might be considered for the post.

It is natural that several Australians fancied themselves as Governor-General and, indeed, one or two occasionally behaved as though they were the obvious choice. The wife of one State Governor was more than a little foolish in disclosing to her friends what she was planning to do at Yarralumla.

About a year ago Mr Whitlam reached a view in discussion with me that only an Australian would be acceptable and that the people would prefer a civilian to a person of military rank. He also thought that it was undesirable to encourage anything in the nature of an Australian vice-regal career service by "promoting" one of the State Governors to Canberra. There was also a feeling against the appointment of anyone who belonged to a socially exclusive group or anyone who had been active in partisan controversies.

.../2

At the same time it was almost essential that any persons nominated should be familiar with Australian parliamentary and political affairs and able to appreciate fully constitutional issues. This virtually narrowed the search for names down to men who had been in Ministerial office but who were not controversial figures and had some personal eminence or to members of the judiciary. Mr Whitlam was also conscious of the need of having a name that would probably be acceptable to the Opposition. Sir John Kerr was clearly the best choice that could have been made and is so recognised by most people. Even the envious could not question his qualifications for the office.

I have known Sir John personally, although not closely, for over thirty years, and we have a high regard for each other. Since the announcement of his appointment I have had several conversations with him and he has been our guest at Government House, Canberra, and at Admiralty House, Sydney. When he enters on his duties he will have a fair knowledge of what is involved, both on the constitutional side and in the public representation of Her Majesty.

Recently he had some anxiety over the health of his wife, but I understand from him that, following a series of tests, the prognosis is favourable and Lady Kerr will be able to resume normal life towards the end of the present week and accompany him to London. From the little I have seen of her and from what I know from conversation with Sir John, I would expect Lady Kerr will not seek to establish a strong identity of her own nor undertake a great number of outside engagements but will play her part as wife of the Governor-General dutifully and well, though with some self-effacement.

The Prime Minister was at first hesitant about a visit to London by the Governor-General-designate because, in a mistaken way, he feared the public might think he had agreed that the new Governor-General should call on the "Queen of England" instead of the "Queen of Australia". He shed this doubt but, at the same time, he expressed to Sir John Kerr the view that, on the way home from London, he should travel through Canada to meet the Canadian Governor-General and see how they do things there. This is partly due I think to a wish to reduce any impression that the Governor-General is being sent to London only. Mr Whitlam also sees some possible examples in Canada for Australia to copy.

One point that worries Mr Whitlam is that the Governors of the Australian States are still appointed by Her Majesty at the instance of a Minister in a non-Australian Government, whereas the Lieutenant Governors of the Canadian Provinces are appointed by the Governor-General. He describes the practice under which the Governors of the States communicate with the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Relations as "archaic" and "colonialist". The British Government, of which the Secretary

.../3

- 3 -

of State is a member, does not have and should not have any say in Australian affairs.

Mr Whitlam himself is sure to raise in due course with the new Lord High Chancellor the constitutional questions involved in the recent communications between the Governors of Queensland and Tasmania and the former Secretary of State, Sir Douglas Home, on off-shore rights. His view is that the only role of the British Government was to advise Her Majesty that this was a matter for Australian advice and leave it at that. Sir John Kerr will be familiar with these matters and it is possible that, on his visit, he may seek to hear your views on this and similar questions.

He may also wish to discuss the national anthem. On this question I am able to advise that, as the result of recent amicable discussion, the Prime Minister readily accepts that, at all public functions the Governor-General, as representative of Her Majesty, should be greeted by six bars of "God Save The Queen" and that this is the appropriate music when the Governor-General is accorded a Royal Salute.

Some lesser points on which Sir John may be interested may concern the formalities at Government House, such as the method of presenting callers, the procedure at dinners and receptions for presenting or receiving guests and the need for an obeisance or a curtsy.

Her Majesty and members of Her Household will have had some opportunity of observing what is done in Australia. I think I would be right in saying that some of the State Government Houses are more formal than is Government House in Canberra. In our own term at Yarralumla my wife and I have tended towards greater easiness of style. The upholders of traditional formality have been members of our own staff and we have occasionally been so bold as to tell them that they are not expected to be "more royal than The Queen". Among guests there is a great disparity. Some want very much to see everything done in a highly formal style; others want a plebeian joviality. We ourselves have taken modes as they come, accepting courtesy but not insisting on what would be given grudgingly. One of the strongest influences on the continued formality of the presentation line is the geography of the House. We have only one large reception room and no "holding paddock", so on any occasion when some order of precedence would be expected by the guests, we have to have a presentation line. At receptions and smaller luncheons and dinners we receive at the door to the drawing room.

Sir John may also wish to discuss with you some of the procedures for communication. You will realise that, owing to staff changes, we are still a relatively inexperienced Government House and that, with my own departure, there will be no-one here with continuous experience stretching back over more than twelve months of the various situations that may arise.

.../4

Sir John, by reason of his own high standing in the profession of the law, will be able to form judgments on constitutional matters and will consider them in depth. It will also be his disposition to seek advice from eminent authority or from his Ministers and not to rely on Government House staff.

In the routine of Government House office and in relationships with Government at the departmental level he will continue to rely on the Official Secretary, Mr David Smith, and I believe he already regards him favourably as efficient and helpful and finds him acceptable as a person. It appears that he intends to bring to Government House as private secretary Miss Sheila Firth, who has been his Associate in his legal office and on the Bench for a number of years. The young Foreign Affairs officer who was acting as my Private Secretary has returned to his department.

My wife's Personal Assistant, Miss Daw, who is the one member of the present Household who was brought to Government House personally by us, wishes to return to her home in Perth when we do. To fill this vacancy Sir John Kerr has approached a very suitable person but no decision has yet been made public.

In the closing stages of the Parliament, a Bill was enacted to raise the allowance of the Governor-General from \$20,000 to \$30,000, - the first change made since the Constitution was made 74 years ago. The Constitution itself provides that the salary shall not be altered during the term of a Governor-General (Section 3) and up to the present no-one had the foresight to propose a change before taking up the appointment.

The same Bill made provision for a pension for a retiring Governor-General. This was a necessary step as Sir John as Chief Justice of New South Wales had substantial provision for a pension which he would have been unwilling to sacrifice if there were no corresponding entitlement for the Governor-General. I will myself be the first to benefit from this particular change and, although I had not asked for it, I will certainly welcome it as a relief from the prospect of rather short commons.

Sir John is expected to return to Australia about the end of June. By that time the results of the elections will be known and we will presumably also know the views of the Prime Minister, whoever it is, about the calling together of Parliament. Before the double dissolution we were discussing plans for the handing over from me to Sir John Kerr but present uncertainties make it difficult to fix timetables and procedures until after polling day.

The tradition has been for an incoming Governor-General to be sworn in the presence of Parliament and for the oath to

.../5

be administered by the Chief Justice. There may be a problem in finding a practicable date for this to be done. In case it is necessary, I have indicated privately to Mr Whitlam and to Sir John Bunting that I would be willing to remain at Canberra for two or three weeks beyond 2 July, which was the date originally set for my departure.

If Mr Whitlam is returned to office the probability is that, after the swearing-in of his Ministry, he would still wish to make the European tour which he had planned, leaving Australia in mid-June, returning in mid-July. The date set for the return of the writs for the election is 29 June and under Section 5 of the Constitution Parliament will have to be summoned within 30 days from that date. One forecast is that, owing to the complexity of the count, it is unlikely that the Chief Returning Officer could give the final result of the count until about 22 June and, allowing time for members to be summoned, the earliest date for a meeting of Parliament might be in mid-July, about the same time as Mr Whitlam's return from overseas. Thus it is possible that the swearing-in of Sir John Kerr might be delayed until somewhere about Wednesday, 17 July or Wednesday, 24 July. It could not be any later. All this is speculative.

If there is a change of government and Mr Snedden becomes Prime Minister the only date we can fix for the present is that Parliament must be called together not later than the week commencing 22 July.

I trust these few observations, written with frankness may be of some help in making Sir John's visit to London a success and giving full value to any discussions he has. I myself have the fullest confidence about the way in which he will fill the office of Governor-General.

Lieutenant-General the Right Honourable
Sir Martin Charteris, K.C.B., K.C.V.O., O.B.E.,
Private Secretary to The Queen,
Buckingham Palace,
LONDON. SW1. ENGLAND.

CONFIDENTIAL



BUCKINGHAM PALACE

16th May, 1974

Dear Governor General

The Queen has read your letter of 6th May giving your impressions of the election campaign with the greatest interest.

By the time you receive this reply the die will have been cast and even if the result is not then known all the data will be available for the computer, which I assume is necessary to work out the results.

I am amazed at the complexity of the voting system as described in your letter. If the British Electorate was asked to go through a comparable intellectual exercise I should confidently predict at least 15 per cent spoiled papers, and the generation of a great deal of aggravation and ill temper.

I shall await the results with the greatest interest.

I have written another letter to you today in reply to your letter about the Governor-Generalship and the point I want to make now should perhaps have been included in that letter rather than this one.

It is this: I know The Queen hopes that Sir John Kerr will continue the custom you have set, more so I think than any of your predecessors in office, of writing with complete freedom and frankness about political affairs in Australia. It would be difficult to overstate the value which your reports have been to Her Majesty - to say nothing of her Private Secretary.

When I see Sir John Kerr I shall of course speak to him about this but I shall be most grateful for anything you feel able to say to him yourself to encourage him to follow your example.

Yours sincerely

Martin Charteris

His Excellency The Governor of Australia.

CONFIDENTIAL



BUCKINGHAM PALACE

16th May, 1974

Dear Governor General

Thank you very much for your most interesting and helpful letter of 6th May about the Governor Generalship and Sir John Kerr's accession to it.

The Queen is much looking forward to receiving Sir John and Lady Kerr on 4th June when they are coming here to luncheon, and I am of course delighted that Mr. Whitlam overcame his hesitancy about this visit.

I think Sir John and Lady Kerr will find their visit to Mr. and Mrs. Jules Leger in Canada interesting. I do not know how well you know them: I find them both highly intelligent and of considerable charm. Mr. Leger is determined to introduce a great deal more informality into the conduct of affairs at Rideau Hall, and I have no doubt that this will give pleasure to some and cause offence to others.

I need not say how much I am looking forward to having a discussion with Sir John and it is of great assistance to know some of the points he may wish to raise.

The system by which Governors of Australian States are appointed by The Queen on the advice of the

British Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary is of course extraordinary and it is not difficult to understand Mr. Whitlam's feelings in this matter. The situation in Canada is of course different because none of the Canadian Provinces lay claim to sovereignty as do the Australian States. If only the Australian States would agree that everything should be done through Canberra, a number of problems for the Monarchy, both current and discernible in the future, would be resolved!

I am of course delighted that Sir John is going to retain David Smith as his Official Secretary as I think we have established a good relationship with him during the last eight months: it is certainly one we value.

Finally, may I say how glad I am that you and Lady Hasluck are to benefit from the Bill which will make provision for a pension for a retiring Governor General.

Yours sincerely
Martin Charteris

His Excellency The Governor General of Australia.

CONFIDENTIAL

Government House,
Canberra. 2600.

11 June 1974.

May I have the honour of bringing under the notice of Her Majesty The Queen some account of the elections held in Australia on 18 May following the granting of a double dissolution of Parliament.

I have delayed making this report so that I would not have to burden Her Majesty with a serial story told in weekly instalments. So much uncertainty surrounded the outcome of the election and the counting of votes was so protracted that the final results will only be known this week.

The Whitlam Government has been returned to office with a majority of five in the House of Representatives (compared with a majority of nine in the old Parliament). In the Senate it seems certain to have 30 seats and has a chance of having 31, compared with 27 in the old Parliament. Thus, the Government has the prospect of a clear three years ahead of it with a workable majority and, although it may still face some difficulty in the passage of its legislation through the Senate, that difficulty will not be as great as in the old Parliament.

The Government has not done as well as it hoped. Nevertheless, having regard to the fact that when the Opposition started to force an election it wanted to gain the government and leave its strength in the Senate undisturbed, the result seems to me to be more clearly a failure for the Opposition than a rebuff for the Government. The Leader of the Opposition, Mr Snedden, has made himself slightly ridiculous by public statements to the effect that Mr Whitlam won the election but he (Mr Snedden) did not lose it.

Nation-wide the total vote for the Government in the House of Representatives poll showed a decrease of only 0.3 percent on the total vote when it won office in December, 1972. It did slightly better in New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia than in 1972, and slightly worse in South Australia and had a drop of 3.2 percent in Queensland and 3.8 in Tasmania. Broadly speaking, it was well supported in metropolitan and suburban electorates and lost ground in country electorates.

.../2

The size of its majority in the House became somewhat chancy because the count in several electorates was very close. The Opposition retained one seat by a majority of only twelve votes and the Government held some seats by a majority of only a few hundred out of enrolments of fifty to sixty thousand. Although early in the count at least sixteen seats were regarded as "doubtful" only nine changed hands. The Government won two seats from the Liberal Party and also won two newly-created seats. It lost one seat in Queensland and one seat in New South Wales to the Liberal Party and lost two seats in Queensland and one seat in New South Wales to the Country Party. A few thousand votes either way could have made the outcome quite different.

The Prime Minister, in a press statement shortly after the poll, when the outcome was still uncertain, said that the result of the election was "muffled".

In my view, the "muffling" was due in part to two features of the Australian electoral system by reason of which the number of seats won by a party may not always correspond closely to the total support for the party.

One is the method of fixing the boundaries of electorates. In the first place there is a weighting of votes in favour of rural areas. A variation of twenty percent is allowed from the quota fixed statistically as the standard enrolment of an electorate. As a consequence country electorates have fewer voters in them than urban electorates. Furthermore, whenever there is a redistribution of electorates, the boundary commissioners often try scrupulously to be fair and produce many seats that are so evenly balanced that, in the absence of any marked electoral swing, a seat can change hands by reason of only a few scores of votes.

The second feature of the electoral system is preferential voting. Voters place a number against each candidate in order of their preference. In the counting of votes, whereas no notice is taken of the preferences of those who have given their No 1 vote to one or other of the two leading candidates, the preferences marked by those who voted first for the weaker candidates virtually decides the outcome of any close contest. The argument is that those who do not get their own candidate returned should not lose the chance to express a choice between the two leading candidates. This refinement of the method of ascertaining the will of the people means in practice that if, for example, 26,000 vote for Candidate A, 24,000 for Candidate B, 2,000 for Candidate C and 1,000 for Candidate D; and, on the distribution of preferences, 900 of the second or third preferences of C and D go to A and 2,100 go to B, then A will lose the election by 100 votes.

My own guess is that often the support for minor candidates expresses discontent on a single issue and so Candidate A may fail to get sufficient of their preferences to win the seat simply because he or his party gave offence or failed to commend itself to a handful of electors on a single local issue. Parties win elections by winning seats - a truism unknown to some political analysts - and the winning of seats in the Australian setting (except when there is a major electoral swing) depends to some extent on what practising politicians call "the luck of the count", and to some extent on local issues.

- 3 -

The point of what I have been writing is illustrated by the fact that, if voting in Australia was on the system of "first past the post", as in Britain, the result would have been 73 seats for the Government and 54 for the Opposition - a majority of 19 instead of 5. Although the Government obtained over 3,600,000 votes for the House of Representatives over the whole nation its survival with a majority of five was the outcome of winning or losing a dozen seats by a mere handful of votes. If in the Western Australian seat of Stirling, (retained by the Liberals by a majority of 12) the Government candidate had won seven more votes, the Government's majority in the House of Representatives would have been seven and not five. If in the seat of Eden-Monaro the Government candidate had received sixty fewer votes the majority of the Government in the House would have been three, not five. In New South Wales, the Government lost one seat by a very narrow margin and failed to gain an adjoining seat by a similar narrow margin largely, I believe, because there was a local issue about the siting of a new airport.

Because of these peculiarities of the Australian electoral system, and because there was no marked swing one way or the other, the final outcome of the election remained indefinite for two weeks after polling day, while the electoral officers waited for outstanding postal votes to come in from remote parts of the world, where Australians were travelling, before they could start counting the preferences.

Nation-wide there was no marked swing either for or against the Government, so the "luck of the count" and, in my opinion, some of the lesser issues of the campaign played a part in producing the final result. In the House of Representatives electorates the Government received 49.3 percent of the primary votes, the Liberals 34.9 percent, the Country Party 10.7 percent and all other parties 4.9 percent.

My own evaluation of the campaign was that the strongest elements in favour of the Government were the voters' willingness to give it "a fair go" and let it prove itself instead of turning it out after only 18 months in office, some feeling about obstruction of Government legislation by the Senate and an opinion that Whitlam is a better Prime Minister than Snedden could be. The strongest elements against the Government were the way in which it has offended considerable sections of opinion by trying to force a national anthem of its own choosing on the people, the shaking of confidence in the honour of the Prime Minister because of his part in Mr Gair's appointment to Eire and various other episodes which have seemed to reveal high-handed disregard of other people's opinions. Mr Whitlam has aroused enthusiasm among some but also provoked strong dislike among others. It is a long time since I have heard such hate expressed against a political leader by those whom he has angered. Labour Party supporters themselves believe that they also attracted a strong body of support from the younger voters, especially the 18-21 years group now voting for the first time, and that this balanced the unfavourable opinions in older age groups. I myself see signs that the Labour Party has an appeal to some new and adventurous forces in Australian life.

On the side of the Opposition, Mr Snedden performed better on the platform than had been expected and his supporters believe that he presented himself as a credible candidate for the Prime Ministership. The Opposition appeared to have strong support in financial, commercial and managerial quarters and,

although numerically these important persons form only a minority of voters, they had some influence on opinion and probably gave financial backing. One newspaper columnist calculated that the Opposition spent about seven times as much as the Government on the campaign. It was obvious from some of the advertisements that the Labour Party has scared some entrenched people.

This section of opinion and some of the newspapers held the view that inflation was the major issue of the campaign and praised Mr Snedden for making it the issue. I have my own doubts whether inflation made any difference to the voting. The big majority of the people still have spending power and still seem to be using it cheerfully. High prices are still being seen by many of them in simple terms as providing a case for higher wages. Those who have got savings find that they can get 12 percent for them instead of 6 percent.

Undoubtedly in the near future more and more people are going to be hurt by the effects of inflation and by the attempts to cope with it, but at election time I saw no signs that the people in their millions were greatly worried about inflation. Moreover, even if Mr Snedden could claim merit for having raised the issue, any thoughtful voter was unlikely to be convinced that the Opposition knew as much about its causes or had any better ideas about handling it than the Government had. Indeed, if the handling of inflation were an issue, my guess would be that the Government earned more votes out of it than the Opposition.

Nevertheless, the Opposition seems to have come out of the campaign with a feeling that they gained ground and did something heroic for Australia. Mr Snedden has been confirmed as leader of the Liberal Party and in the near future seems to be secure in that position even although dissension inside the party is evident.

One result of the election was a decline in support for the minority parties - the Democratic Labour Party and the Australia Party. The D.L.P. will not have any representation in the new Parliament. The fading away of these smaller parties may well be a good thing for Australian politics in bringing virtually a return to a two-party system with the Australian Labour Party on one side and the Liberal Party and Country Party on the other.

In the campaign, the referendum on the four questions referred to the electors after Bills had twice failed to pass the Senate was obscured by the elections for Parliament. In the campaign the substance of these questions was scarcely mentioned, let alone debated. Personally I thought this a pity as the questions deserved thoughtful attention. All four questions failed to obtain the necessary majority of votes and the necessary approval by a majority of States.

Following the completion of the count in the House of Representatives and when the prospective result of the Senate election could be foreseen, the Labour Party held its caucus meeting to elect a new Ministry. I shall be reporting on that event separately.

One remaining problem concerns the summoning of Parliament. On present calculations the Senate count can be completed in time for the return of writs on 25 June and for the meeting of Parliament on 9 July. If, however, a recount of the Senate vote is demanded in any of the States, - and this is probable if the distribution of preferences gives the tenth seat to a winner by a small majority - it is doubtful whether the count could be completed in time for us to keep to that timetable. The precaution has already been taken of extending the period for the return of the writs for the Senate election in case there has to be a recount. In that event, the date for the opening of Parliament would have to be either 16 July or 23 July.

Because we wish to preserve the convention by which the Governor-General takes the oath of office in the presence of Parliament, and, as there has to be a Governor-General to summon Parliament and to open it, it has become necessary for me to remain in office until the day after the opening of the new Parliament, whenever it may be. The tentative arrangements we are making, irrespective of date, are that I will open Parliament on a Tuesday afternoon and take my departure from Canberra on a Wednesday morning. Sir John Kerr will arrive in Canberra on Wednesday afternoon and commence his term when he takes the oath of office in Parliament on Thursday morning.

I expect to swear in the new Ministry tomorrow and will do myself the honour of reporting on the occasion after it has taken place.

Lieutenant-Colonel the Right Honourable
Sir Martin Charteris, K.C.B., K.C.V.O., O.B.E.,
Private Secretary to The Queen,
Buckingham Palace,
LONDON. SW1. ENGLAND.

CONFIDENTIAL

Government House,
Canberra. 2600.

12 June 1974.

As reported by telegram today, a swearing-in ceremony was held at Government House and the Second Whitlam Ministry now resumes work at full strength after a period of uncertainty.

Immediately after the general election on 18 May the Prime Minister seemed to be unsure what he would do next. He was clinging to the idea that he might proceed with the tour of Europe which he had planned to commence in mid-June and come back in mid-July for the opening of Parliament. I counselled him strongly against that course. After some days of uncertainty he abandoned the idea.

He was then eager to bring on the meeting of Parliament to a date in June but the Chief Electoral Officer told him that the count could not be completed in time to make certain who would be the Senators and Members to be summoned to a Parliament in June. He tried for 2 July and rather reluctantly had to accept that the earliest possible date was 9 July. It is still uncertain whether that date will be practicable.

He also faced a problem about fixing a date for the meeting of the Parliamentary Labour Party (popularly known as Caucus). Under party rules, which require a meeting to be called within three weeks after an election, he could not hold the meeting later than 10 June. But it was still uncertain which members in marginal seats would survive and the names of Senators would not be declared by the returning officers until the end of June. There had to be a certain amount of intelligent guess-work in summoning parliamentarians to attend.

The party meeting was held on 10 June and proceeded to a series of exhaustive ballots to pick a Ministry. Beforehand all sorts of changes had been predicted. In the end, after a day and night of balloting, Mr Whitlam was presented with the same set of Ministers as he had before the election, except that Mr Grassby, who lost his seat, was replaced by Senator Wheeldon. The series of ballots started off with what looked like success for the Left Wing but then the party room seemed to get nervous and voted conservatively.

Seniority in the Ministry is fixed by the order in which Ministers are elected by the party and here there were some surprises. Mr Connor, the tough, determined, cool-headed Minister for Minerals and Energy, who used to be No 21 in

.../2

seniority is now No 3. He has been much criticised in public by mining magnates but has obviously pleased his party by the checks he has given to private enterprise, both foreign and domestic, and to some State Governments in exploitation of mineral resources.

The result of the ballots was disappointing to Mr Whitlam inasmuch as he had hoped that five or six Ministers whose performance had been poor might be dropped and five or six promising younger men might have been selected. Furthermore he felt it wise in the circumstances to abandon the hope he had of making some changes in departmental structure and to transfer several Ministers from one portfolio to another.

Personally I think it is a great pity for Australia that some of the less competent Ministers have remained in office and that some much-needed changes have not been made. I could have named five who would never have been missed and I feel sympathy for the Prime Minister as one would have sympathy for any skilled workman obliged to do the best he can with bent and blunt tools.

Nevertheless the Ministry gives promise of being stable and mostly diligent and it includes some very good Ministers, even although some of them might do better with portfolios other than the ones they have.

Mr Cairns, who is now Deputy Leader of the Party and who will be Acting Prime Minister if and when Mr Whitlam travels overseas again, has been identified in past years with many Left-Wing causes and some people regard him as "a dangerous man". Personally I have regard for him and credit him with responsibility, sincerity and capacity, although I would not go so far as some of his admirers do in crediting him with great powers as a thinker or as being an economic expert. I think he is ambitious, sugar-coating his ambition with much talk of devotion to principle. He will serve as a restraint on Mr Whitlam, and both of them will be watching the other. At present, however, I see no reason why they should not work successfully together. Mr Whitlam will certainly have to make a readjustment of his own method of working now that he no longer has the staunchly loyal but pedestrian support of the wholly dependable Mr Barnard as deputy.

There was pleasant comradeship and enthusiasm when the full Ministry came to Government House today. I think that, by and large, Her Majesty has got nearly as good an Australian Government as might be hoped for in the present state of Australian politics. This Government is led by the only Australian parliamentarian who has the size of a Prime Minister and it is all to the good that he himself is beginning to realise that being Prime Minister calls for command and concentration.

In a friendly talk, with the closeness and confidence we have developed, I told Mr Whitlam that he had some tough national tasks ahead and must do them this year. I also said that, although I did not expect him to let sleeping dogs lie I thought he should resist the temptation to search for fleas on every dog that started to bark. His greatest weakness, I said, was too quick a response to "bright ideas".

- 3 -

As I have said, I would have liked to see a few weak Ministers dropped and a few new men brought in. The Labour Party needs to be grooming a few successors to the older men and giving them Ministerial experience. In general, however, I have a high measure of confidence in the Ministry.

Lieutenant-Colonel the Right Honourable
Sir Martin Charteris, K.C.B., K.C.V.O., O.B.E.,
Private Secretary to The Queen,
Buckingham Palace,
LONDON. SW1. ENGLAND.



BUCKINGHAM PALACE

PERSONAL AND PRIVATE

11th July, 1974.

Dear Sir Paul

This letter is written on the day that your term of office as Governor-General comes to an end, indeed, because we live at the antipodes it came to an end during what was for us - last night.

I am writing at the command of The Queen to send to you her sincere thanks for the distinguished and loyal service you have given her as Governor-General. Her Majesty's thanks go in equal measure to Lady Hasluck who has supported you so magnificently during your time at Yarralumla.

Her Majesty's gratitude goes to you, not only for the dignity and probity with which you have represented her in Australia for the last five years, but also for the marvellous way in which you have kept her informed of the political and social scene.

The remarkable series of letters which you have written are a most valuable addition to The Queen's Archive, where, I need hardly say, they will be preserved in complete confidence.

Perhaps, however, one day when you and I and indeed all the dramatis personae are long since dead, some historian may find in them an invaluable source of information on what was going on in Australia a hundred or two hundred years ago. I think he will not only value them for their perspicacity but also for their style and wit.

I shall certainly miss them !

If you and Lady Hasluck are to be in London at any time I know you will let me know as it would certainly be The Queen's wish to receive you.

May I say, finally, how grateful my colleagues and I are for all the kindness and consideration you have shown to us. We are much in your debt.

Yours sincerely

Marlin Hartens

The Right Honourable
Sir Paul Hasluck, G.C.M.G., G.C.V.O.

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

Government House,
Canberra. 2600.

25 June 1974.

It has become necessary for me to correct part of the information given in my recent despatch regarding the results of the elections held in Australia on 18 May, 1974.

The completion of counting for the Senate has yielded a final result of 29 Senate seats for the Government, 29 for the Opposition and two Independents (one from South Australia and one from Tasmania).

In my earlier report I had confidently forecast that the Government would have 30 seats and had a chance of obtaining 31. The distribution of preferences in Queensland and in New South Wales, however, was less favourable to the Government than had been expected and they gained only four seats in Queensland (and not five) and five in New South Wales (not six).

The two Independents in the new Senate are more likely to favour the Opposition than the Government but give signs of a more responsible approach to the Senate's role as a second Chamber than did the members of the Democratic Labour Party and two of the three Independents in the old Parliament. Consequently the Government, with three more Senators and with no members of the Democratic Labour Party to face in the Senate, is still in a better position than it was before the election.

The results of the Senate elections have now been declared and no recounts have been granted by the Chief Electoral Officer. Hence it will be possible for the Parliament to meet on 9 July.

.../2

In these circumstances my wife and I expect to leave Canberra on 10 July and my term of office will conclude with the swearing-in of Sir John Kerr in Parliament on 11 July.

Lieutenant-Colonel the Right Honourable
Sir Martin Charteris, K.C.B., K.C.V.O., O.B.E.,
Private Secretary to The Queen,
Buckingham Palace,
LONDON. ENGLAND.